

To: Distribution
From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia
Telecommunications

A meeting of the Telecommunications Transmission Facility Coordinating Group (TTFCG) was held on December 12, 2001. The following people were in attendance:

MEMBERS

Jane Lawton OCA (240) 777-3724
Michael Ma M-NCPPC (301) 495-4595
Pat Hanehan MCPS (301) 279-3609
Eric Carzon DBM (240) 777-2763
Dave Niblock DPS (240) 777-6252
Willem Van Aller DIST (240) 777-2994

STAFF

Amy Rowan OCA (240) 777-3684
Margie Williams OCA (240) 777-3762
Robert Hunnicutt CTC (410) 964-5700
Lee Afflerbach CTC (410) 964-5700

OTHER ATTENDEES

Lee Jarmon Nextel (410) 953-7440 (FAX) 953-7406
Bill O'Brien VoiceStream (443) 570-1032
Steve Weber VoiceStream (571) 277-0235
Carolyn Mitchell Cingular Wireless
Jim Michal Jackson, Campbell (202) 457-1600
Janet Brown Jackson, Campbell (202) 457-1600
Jennifer Tabeling Cingular (410) 712-7835
M.G. Diamond Counsel for Verizon
Mike Winberg Resident (301) 216-9690
Tim Boyce Sprint PCS
Greg Primeau Sprint Spectrum (201) 512-8810
Russ Shipley Spectrasite (301) 925-1800
Stephen Mordfin Ben Dyer Assoc. (301) 430-2000
Henri Edith Sprint PCS (301) 214-9350
Carl Morgan Council-Dacek Ofc (240) 777-7972
Joy Nurmi Council-Praisner Ofc (240) 777-7953
Hillorie Morrison VoiceStream (443) 570-0014

Action Item: Approval of November 14, 2001 minutes: Amy Rowan noted several typos in the minutes to be corrected. Dave Niblock moved the minutes be approved as amended. Eric Carzon seconded and the minutes were approved.

Discussion Item - Upcoming Meeting Dates: Bob Hunnicutt distributed a proposed schedule of TTFCG meeting dates for the next six months. Eric Carzon and Willem Van Aller noted that they had conflicts with the 10:00 a.m. meeting time, as they had regular staff meetings at that time. Bob Hunnicutt noted that Tracey Williams had difficulty making afternoon meetings and that the January 17 meeting was scheduled in the morning to accommodate the State and MPT representatives expected to attend that meeting. The members decided the January 17

meeting would be held at 11:00 a.m., and all other meetings on the schedule would be held at 2:00 p.m.

Consent Agenda Item:

Eric Carzon requested that item #1 be removed from the consent agenda for review.

Consent Agenda:

2. Sprint PCS application to attach 9 antennas at the 180' level of an existing 190' monopole on the Clement Property located at 25217 Peach Tree Road in Clarksburg (Application #200111-03).

3. Nextel Communications application to add 6 antennas to the 6 existing antennas on the penthouse roof walls of a building located at 962 Wayne Avenue in Silver Spring (Application #200111-04).

Motion: Eric Carzon moved that the remaining consent agenda items #2 and #3 be recommended. Pat Hanehan seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item:

1. VoiceStream Wireless application to replace 6) existing antennas with 6) new antennas at the same 161' level on the roof of the Chevy Chase Building located at 5530 Wisconsin Avenue in Chevy Chase (Application #200111-01).

Eric Carzon asked for an explanation of the steel platform on the building roof. Bob Hunnicutt explained that this was not an uncommon design and that the rooftop equipment platforms were often constructed so that the supports rested on the load bearing cross members of the building roof. He added that some management companies and building owners did not like the rooftops penetrated with numerous bolts which may otherwise be necessary to attach the equipment cabinets to the roof. Hillorie Morrison concurred with Mr. Hunnicutt, and added that the support structure would likely not be visible from the street level due to the building height and the platform placement.

Dave Niblock noted that the zone shown on the recommendation form was incorrect and the correct zone should be CBD.

Motion: Eric Carzon moved the application be recommended. Dave Niblock seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: VoiceStream Wireless application to attach 6 antennas at the 166' level on a 230' tower to be built to replace the existing tower at the Kenwood Country Club located at 5601 River Road in Bethesda (Application #200111-02).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application and noted that this tower had not yet been constructed. He had not been able to ascertain the status of the antennas on the existing tower or their placement on the new tower from the County or from the applicant.

Mr. Van Aller stated that the new tower would be the same height as the existing tower and that all of the antennas on the existing

tower would be relocated to appropriate locations on the new tower.

Pat Hanehan asked what the setback was from the adjacent Board of Education property. Mr. Hunnicutt referred to the site plan, and stated that the distance appeared to be 130 feet. Dave Niblock noted that §59-G-2.43 (d) stated that any broadcast tower erected prior to 1970, which the existing tower was, were exempt from setback requirements and could be reconstructed as long as the height was not increased.

Eric Carzon asked if there would be any conflict for the public safety radio system with the placement of additional antennas on the structure. Mr. Van Aller stated there would not be any conflict. Bob Hunnicutt added that AT&T and CBS had antennas on the existing structure and that during the engineering review it was determined there would not be a conflict with the Public Safety radio system.

Jane Lawton noted it would be helpful for the Tower Coordinator to know how many carriers the new tower could accommodate.

Motion: Pat Hanehan moved the application be recommended. Eric Carzon seconded the motion, conditioned on the additional antennas not creating a conflict with the public safety radio system, and that the tower was structurally capable of accommodating the additional antennas. The motion was approved with Willem Van Aller abstaining. Jane Lawton asked the Tower Coordinator to request the design capacity for the new tower from the tower company.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to attach antennas at the 193' level on a 15' extension to an existing 178' monopole on the Weitzer Property located at 14705 Sugarland Road in Poolesville (Application #200111-05).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application and noted that a structural analysis for the extension to accommodate these antennas had been provided. He noted that once this attachment was completed, the tower would be at maximum capacity. He also stated that this antenna siting had been reviewed in August at a lower elevation; however, Sprint had redefined the adjacent cells to which this site would connect, necessitating the need for greater elevation at this location.

Mr. Hunnicutt added that at the time of the original Special Exception for this monopole, there had been some objections from nearby residents. He did not believe that the 15' height increase would be noticed because the monopole is set back far from the road and tall trees surround the property.

Mr. Van Aller stated that he would expect the difference in elevation to only result in a minimal difference in improved signal coverage. Mr. Hunnicutt replied that he had requested RF maps for the Sprint antennas at the lower elevation using the locations for the previous adjacent site positions and RF maps for the antennas as proposed in this new application. He stated that Julie Modlin had reviewed those documents and determined that the

increase in elevation appeared to be necessary to make connection to the other sites. He added that the increase in tower height was 15' and the original Sprint attachment was at 168' and not at the top of the monopole as currently proposed. Mr. Van Aller stated he was satisfied with Ms. Modlin's review.

Eric Carzon asked why the other adjacent sites had changed. Jim Michal explained that when the original application was submitted in August, Sprint had not completed negotiations for the adjacent sites. He stated that, in the end, different locations were selected and they have now established lease agreements with those property owners.

Motion: Willem Van Aller moved the application be recommended. Eric Carzon seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved, conditioned on any Special Exception modifications as may be necessary for the increased height.

Discussion item - Aspen Landscape Monopole Structural Modifications: Bob Hunnicutt distributed drawings and photographs of Crown Atlantic's proposed structural changes to the Aspen Landscape monopole needed in order to accommodate additional carriers.

M.G. Diamond explained that this information was provided as an advisory to the TTFCG. He stated that Crown Atlantic had the option of either building a new monopole at this location or strengthening the existing monopole. He stated that building a new monopole would require a new foundation and necessitate taking the existing carriers off-air, which they were prohibited from doing by the terms of their lease agreement with the carriers. He stated that placing a new monopole at a different location on the property would also not meet the setback requirements and would result in a request for a new Special Exception. In this case, he stated that Crown Atlantic made a business decision to make the structural improvements to accommodate existing carriers.

Jane Lawton asked if additional carriers would go on the structural supports or on the existing monopole. Mr. Diamond stated that there would be space above the structural supports to accommodate additional carriers.

Dave Niblock asked if this would require modification to the Special Exception. Mr. Diamond replied that the Board of Appeals had already approved this modification.

There was discussion as to whether or not this type of change to a structure should be required to come before the TTFCG for formal review. Bob Hunnicutt explained that in cases where there had been minor modifications for equipment sheds, for example, it had been decided that a simple notification to the Tower Coordinator would suffice. He added that for the change out of antennas, because it involved different frequencies and equipment, the group decided that those were required to come back for a formal review by the TTFCG.

Jane Lawton stated that the TTFCG should be aware that these

types of structural modifications are possible and that they may see more of them in the future, but she did not believe this change had to go through a formal TTFCG review.

Eric Carzon stated that he believed this notification was important for the group because it kept them aware as to a structure's ability to accommodate additional carriers.

In response to questions regarding record keeping of this information, Bob Hunnicutt commented that the database did not contain information regarding how many carriers a structure can accommodate. He said that when capacity questions arise, he reviews the Special Exception documentation to determine if there was any testimony given regarding the number of carriers the structure was designed to accommodate. If there are remaining questions regarding the structure's ability to accommodate additional antennas, he requests a structural analysis from the carrier.

Discussion item - VoiceStream Monopole at Hungerford Property: Bob Hunnicutt stated that he had received a notice that VoiceStream had changed the height and location on the site of its monopole on the Hungerford property. Bob Hunnicutt noted that the TTFCG had conditioned its recommendation on VoiceStream re-designing this monopole to blend in better with its environment.

Hillorie Morrison explained that, in response to the TTFCG comments during the application review process, VoiceStream had taken measures to address concerns expressed by the group. She stated that the monopole height had been lowered to 120' and it had been relocated to a different location on the property. She stated that the lower elevation provided adequate coverage, although not at the 150' level VoiceStream would have preferred.

Discussion item - MPT Application Update: Jane Lawton noted that the State had not yet provided answers to all of the TTFCG's questions from the last meeting. She expected that the State would provide answers in time for a review at the January meeting.

Hillorie Morrison noted that the State claimed that a benefit of having this tower would be that other carriers could attach to it. She stated that she wanted to make the group aware that it was extremely difficult for a carrier to enter into a lease agreement for towers on State property. Mr. Van Aller agreed that the State's process was rigorous. M.G. Diamond concurred and stated that, in the past, bonding issues had created a problem for the carriers. Mr. Van Aller commented that he did not believe that was a problem today because State towers are funded directly from the operating budget. Ms. Morrison stated that one of the main problems is the term of the lease, an initial five-year limit with renewals. She noted that was a difficult condition from a business standpoint. Mr. Van Aller agreed and stated that when the application came up for consideration, the benefit of allowing others to attach to the tower should be given minimal consideration. M.G. Diamond pointed out that there was a five-year limit with renewals on the County's lease agreements also,

but that the County had been very good about approving renewals.

Bob Hunnicutt asked if that was the reason for the delay in removing the existing tower at the Montgomery College - Germantown Campus, where the State had erected a new tower immediately adjacent to the old tower. Mr. Van Aller stated that the reason the old tower is still standing might be because it takes so long (six months, in this case) for the carriers to negotiate attachment to the new tower.

Jim Michal noted that since County Council staff was present at today's meeting, he wanted to make a point that in up-county rural areas, coverage is very poor or non-existent, and that new towers would be necessary in the up county areas to meet the demands of citizens and businesses.

Carl Morgan stated that the Council was aware of the up county needs, and that the County is not anti-tower and looks forward to working with both the carriers and the community in the placement of any new towers which may be necessary.

Greg Primeau stated that he agreed that it was very difficult to deal with the State agencies in negotiating lease agreements to attach antennas to their tower facilities. He offered to provide a sample lease, marked to indicate areas where Sprint had experienced problems with the State. Mr. Van Aller noted there had been contention between the State and Federal agencies on contracts as well. Mr. Morgan noted this might be relevant because the State had submitted a letter from the F.B.I. that it may wish to attach its antennas to the new MPT tower.

Lee Afflerbach stated that if the TTFCG had concerns with these issues, it would be appropriate for the Tower Coordinator to advise the State of these issues now so they would be prepared to address them at the January meeting. Jane Lawton agreed, and asked the Tower Coordinator to advise the State of these concerns.

Discussion item - Board Of Appeals Ruling on AT&T/Burrows Farm monopole: Jane Lawton explained that the Board of Appeals had upheld its earlier decision to require that any telecommunications facility must meet the minimum lot size in that zone. She stated that this could impact TTFCG reviews in the future and that there may be legislative changes resulting from this decision. She stated that it was presently a Board of Appeals issue and not a TTFCG issue.

M.G. Diamond stated that this issue had come up previously with the V.F.W. site at Great Falls. He said that the Board of Appeals had ruled that if a tower was being replaced, two acres was not needed for every applicant that planned to attach antennas to the structure. Ms. Lawton asked if they had ruled on the issue of the monopole owner alone being required to meet the lot size requirement. Mr. Diamond stated they had not ruled on that issue.

Pat Hanehan asked if the lease in that case had been an exclusive or non-exclusive lease. Mr. Diamond stated it was non-exclusive,

and that the Park and Planning Commission had required them to lease enough space to accommodate additional equipment shelters in the future.

Discussion item - FAA Review for Telecommunications Facilities Near Airports: Dave Niblock stated that he was aware that the FAA was now giving closer scrutiny to any tower within ten miles of an airport. Mr. Van Aller stated that this was not a new regulation but that they were now evidently enforcing that requirement.

The next meeting of the TTFCG is scheduled for Thursday, January 17, 2001 at 11:00 a.m. in the 2nd floor conference room #225 of the COB.